

Remarks

This REPLY is in response to the Office Action mailed July 29, 2009.

I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed July 29, 2009, Claims 1-6, 49, 53, 54, 56-60, 62, and 67-99 were pending. In the Office Action, Claims 1, 3-4, 49, 53-54, 57-58, 62, 67, 69-70, 75, 77-78, 84-85, 87-88, 92-93, and 95-96 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hotti et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,970,876, hereafter Hotti) in view of Golshani et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,806,066, hereafter Golshani), and in further view of Wotring et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,853,997, hereafter Wotring '997). Claims 2-3, 5-6, 29-30, 56-57, 59-60, 68-69, 71-72, 76, 77, 79-80, 86-87, 89-90, 94-95, and 97-98 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hotti, in view of Golshani, and further in view of Wotring et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,665,677, hereafter Wotring '677).

II. Summary of Applicant's Amendment

No claims are being amended by the present Reply, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-6, 49, 53-54, 56-60, 62, and 67-99. Reconsideration of the Application, in view of the following comments, is respectfully requested.

III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In the Office Action mailed July 29, 2009, Claims 1, 3-4, 49, 53-54, 57-58, 62, 67, 69-70, 75, 77-78, 84-85, 87-88, 92-93, and 95-96 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hotti (U.S. Patent No. 6,970,876) in view of Golshani (U.S. Patent No. 5,806,066), and in further view of Wotring '997 (U.S. Patent No. 6,853,997). Claims 2-3, 5-6, 29-30, 56-57, 59-60, 68-69, 71-72, 75, 77, 79-80, 86-87, 89-90, 94-95, and 97-98 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hotti, in view of Golshani, and further in view of Wotring '677 (U.S. Patent No. 6,665,677).

Claim 1

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of Claim 1, in view of the remarks provided below.

Claim 1 recites creating at least one content node for each of the plurality of content repositories and associating each content node with its own schema; and applying the hierarchy node's schema to each of the child content nodes.

In the Office Action, it was asserted that Hotti discloses this feature. However, Applicant respectfully submits that Hotti appears to disclose that a schema is created for a database node and that the schema can later be upgraded to a new revision of the schema. Thus, Hotti appears to disclose that different versions of the same schema may be applied to a node in succession (i.e., a schema is applied to a node, the schema is upgraded, then the upgraded schema is applied to the node).

In Claim 1, however, each hierarchy node is a container for one or more content nodes, and each content node is associated with its own schema. Furthermore, the schema associated with a hierarchy node is applied to each child content node. Thus, in Claim 1 both the schema associated with a content node and the schema associated with its parent hierarchy node, are applied to the content node. Applicant respectfully submits that Hotti, in view of Golshani and Wotring '997, does not disclose or render obvious this feature.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1, as currently amended, is neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 53, 67, 75, 84, and 92

The comments provided above with respect to Claim 1 are hereby incorporated by reference. Claims 53, 67, 75, 84, and 92 have been similarly amended to more clearly recite the embodiments therein. For similar reasons as provided above with respect to Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 53, 67, 75, 84, and 92, as amended, are likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-6, 49, 54, 56-60, 62, 68-74, 76-82, 85-91, and 93-99

Claims 2-6, 49, 54, 56-60, 62, 68-74, 76-82, 85-91, and 93-99 have not been addressed separately herein; however, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are allowable at least as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the amendments to the independent claims, and the comments provided above. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 2-6, 49, 54, 56-60, 62, 68-74, 76-82, 85-91, and 93-99, are similarly neither

anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

A Petition for Extension of Time is enclosed herewith. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 29, 2009

By: /Nathan L. Feld/
Nathan L. Feld
Reg. No. 59,725

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Customer No. 80548